

**REMARKS**

Please reconsider this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

- Claims 1-10 and 12-13 are pending.
- Claims 1-3, 5-10, 12 and 13 are rejected.

Claims 1 and 5 were amended to correct grammatical mistakes.

Applicant relies on the limitation “having an average particle size of 0.1 to 1.0  $\mu\text{m}$ ” to distinguish the instant invention over the prior art. As the Examiner states in each of the anticipation/obviousness rejections in the current office action that include claim 1, none of the references explicitly or inherently discloses this limitation. This means that none of the references anticipates Claim 1.

The Examiner contends that selecting pigments with the limitation set out above would be obvious to a skilled artisan in the absence of unexpected results. Applicant provides with this response a declaration showing the unexpected results achieved by using the particle size range as recited in Applicant’s claims.

The declaration shows that, if the particle size of the pigment falls below the range recited in the claims, an ink with unsuitable covering and visibility properties is obtained. The declaration also shows that, if the particle size of the pigment falls above the range recited in the claims, an ink that exhibits nozzle clogging problems is obtained.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for her granting of an interview related to this declaration data and points out that Applicant has provided additional data as the Examiner requested during the interview.

Since all claims are in a condition for allowance, please issue a Notice of Allowability so stating. If I can be of any help, please contact me.

Respectfully submitted,



Charles E. Runyan, Ph. D.  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 43,066

Date: May 6, 2005

---

Squire, Sanders & Dempsey L.L.P.  
One Maritime Plaza  
Suite 300  
San Francisco, CA 94111  
Facsimile (415) 393-9887  
Telephone (415) 954-0235  
crunyan@ssd.com